



D. Gauvin
#4
1.17.03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 09/699,818
Filed: 10/30/00
Applicant: Ganz
For: High Capacity Microarray
Dispensing

Examiner: Gordon, B.R.
Group Art: 1743

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I certify that this document is being deposited on <u>1/16/03</u> with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the:	
Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231	
 Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence	
John R. Ross, III Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence	

Amendment A

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Sir,

This letter is in response to Office Action dated 08/06/2002. A request for a two month extension of time has been submitted with this response.

JAN 15 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

RECEIVED

REMARKS

Specification Objection

Examiner has stated that the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, Examiner has stated that "the specification does not make any reference to the elements of the invention as being "means". Examiner also states that Claims 1 – 6 and 32 – 37 are considered to be essentially duplicate claims. In response, Applicant submits that Claims 32 – 37 are not duplicate claims of Claims 1 – 6. Rather, Claims 32 – 37 are "means-plus-function" claims written in accordance with 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph. Please note, Claims 32 – 37 are "means-plus-function" claims even though they do not specifically recite "means for". As clearly stated in Section 2181 of the MPEP:

While traditional "means for" or "step for" language does not automatically make an element a means-(or step-) plus-function element, conversely, lack of such language does not prevent a limitation from being